

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

United States of America,

Case No. 24-CR-00206(2) (JMB/SGE)

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

Amir Raheem McKeever,

Defendant.

This matter is before the Court on a document filed by Defendant Amir Raheem McKeever, which is described as his “combined response to the Court’s rulings” and which is titled “Pro Se Additional Motion.” (Doc. No. 114.) The Court construes the filing as a request for review of the Magistrate Judge’s March 20, 2025 Order (Doc. No. 101) denying McKeever’s dispositive motion (Doc. No. 87) and denying as untimely five of the six motions filed by McKeever in March 2025 (Doc. Nos. 95, 97, 98, 99, and 100).¹

Courts conduct a de novo review of any portion of an R&R to which a petitioner makes specific objections. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); D. Minn. L.R. 72.2(b). Courts also give the filings and objections of self-represented litigants liberal construction. *Stone v. Harry*, 364 F.3d 912, 914 (8th Cir. 2004). Upon review of an objection, courts “may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive

¹ Although the introductory paragraph references McKeever’s discovery motion (Doc. No. 58), none of the discussion in the document challenges any aspect of the Magistrate Judge’s ruling on the nondispositive discovery motion. (*See generally* Doc. No. 114.)

further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); D. Minn. L.R. 72.2(b).

In this case, the Court has reviewed the Magistrate Judge’s Order (Doc. No. 101) and concludes that the order did not fully address the issues raised in McKeever’s motions. As a result, the Court would benefit from additional consideration of these motions.

Therefore, based upon the foregoing, and on all of the files, records and proceedings herein, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Court grants the request for review and returns the matter to the Magistrate Judge for further consideration, as follows:

1. The matter is RETURNED to the Magistrate Judge to consider the arguments and legal issues raised in McKeever’s dispositive motion (Doc. No. 87) and the related motions (Doc. Nos. 95, 97, 98, 99, and 100). The Magistrate Judge shall issue a Report and Recommendation concerning these motions.
2. Pursuant to the applicable rules of civil procedure, Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a), (b); D. Minn. L.R. 72.2(a), (b), the parties shall file objections to the Report and Recommendations or seek review of the Order within 14 days after receiving a copy of the Magistrate Judge’s decision and the parties may respond to the objections to the Report and Recommendation within 14 days of receiving a copy of the objections made by the other party.

Dated: May 8, 2025

/s/ Jeffrey M. Bryan
Judge Jeffrey M. Bryan
United States District Court